

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

CHARLES FIELD, CHAIRMAN
YUBA COUNTY TRANS. COMM.
(916) 267-2282

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE CHAIRMAN
DEL NORTE CO. TRANS. COMM.
(707) 465-3878

DARIN GROSSI, SECRETARY
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601

Item 1

AGENDA

July 21, 2000

Department of Transportation Building
1120 N Street, Room 1420
Sacramento, California

12:30 p.m.	Item 1	Approval of Agenda (Any members who have brought questions or issues not otherwise shown on the agenda should bring them up during this part of the meeting to be sure time is made to discuss them.)	
12:40 p.m.	Item 2	Approval of Minutes from May 19, 2000	
12:45 p.m.	Item 3	Legislation	C. Oldham
1:00 p.m.	Item 4	Governor's Initiative/Trailer Legislation P. Hathaway	C. McAdam
1:30 p.m.	Item 5	2000 STIP Fund Estimate and Schedule P. Hathaway	C. Field
1:45 p.m.	Item 6	Status Report Concerning ITSP P. Weston (There is no attachment for Item 6)	D. Grossi
2:00 p.m.	Item 7	Rural County Input Toward Proposed Rule Making for Planning, ITS, and NEPA Regulations	S. Scherzinger
2:15 p.m.	Item 8	Rural County Project Delivery Resource Problems	C. Field
2:30 p.m.	Item 9	Caltrans FTA 5311 Program	L. Johnson
2:45 p.m.	Item 10	Status Reports Concerning Other Issues/Objectives/ Assignments	
3:30 p.m.	Adjournment		

DRAFT
CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE
Minutes of May 19, 2000

Meeting was called to order at approximately 12:30 p.m.

Attendance: See attached sign-in sheet.

1. INTRODUCTIONS, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Following introductions Chairman Charles Field (Amador) asked if there was anyone who had items to discuss that were not otherwise shown on the agenda. Rick Gumz announced that he will be retiring from CTC staff and this will be his last RCTF meeting. Rick complimented the RCTF on its growth over the past ten years stating that the Task Force should be proud that it not only serves to provide information and comradery among rural counties, but that it is also now a recognized organization with the ability to affect State policy. Rural County Task Force members thanked Rick Gumz for his service to the Task Force over the years.

Wes McDaniel (El Dorado) announced that El Dorado County Transportation Commission is seeking candidates to serve as its Executive Director.

Charles Field stated that he expects to present the Rural County Task Force Semi-Annual Report during the California Transportation Commission meeting on June 14 or 15, 2000. He doesn't believe that the rural counties will have much time to review the report between the time it is drafted and the time it is put into the CTC agenda. He asked the Task Force if he had authority to go ahead and prepare and present the report based on discussions from today's meeting and past Task Force meetings. No members expressed opposition or concern.

The CTC agenda "book" will soon be available on the Internet. This means that RTPA's can check out staff reports concerning CTC agenda items up to two weeks before each CTC meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 17, 2000

It was moved by Celia McAdam (Placer) and seconded by Pam Couch (Modoc) to approve the minutes as presented. Several members noted with appreciation the fact that action items within the minutes are highlighted.

3. LEGISLATION

Chairman Field stated that discussions of legislation related to the Governor's Transportation Initiative will be delayed until CTC Deputy Director Pete Hathaway arrives. In the meantime he asked if members had need to discuss any legislation not related to the Governor's Initiative.

Charles Field acknowledged with appreciation the attendance at today's meeting by Rebecca Long and Jason Weller of the Legislative Analyst's Office. Rebecca stated that they were intending to hear Rural County Task Force input and concerns regarding transportation funding measures proposed in the Governor's Initiative (revised budget and trailer legislation). Phil Dow (Lake and Mendocino) complimented Rebecca Long and Jason Weller for their document

titled California Travels. He encouraged all Task Force Members and their staffs and agencies to get hold of a copy and read it.

AB 2931:

Terry King (Kings) asked if AB 2931 provides an opportunity for rural and urban counties to ask for an increase in the allowance of STIP funds that can be claimed for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) purposes. **Dan Landon will investigate this possible opportunity.**

AB 2140:

Chuck Oldham clarified that this bill which would increase RTP requirements is written to affect only counties with populations larger than 300,000.

AB 4604:

Phil Dow stated that Humboldt and Mendocino Counties would be impacted by AB 4604 which would require those projects listed on the Governor's Initiative to count against county STIP shares. Charles, Phil, and others agreed that virtually all other rural counties (excluding Humboldt and Mendocino) did not receive projects in the Governor Initiative, therefore the rural counties in spirit would support the intent of AB 4604.

4. CTC APPOINTMENT OF A RURAL COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE

Susan Morrison (Del Norte) advised that the Governor has taken no action on filling the two vacancies that presently exist on the CTC. She has received copies of letters from numerous rural counties supporting either or both of the rural county candidates who have applied for these seats on the CTC. The rural county nominees thus far are Judith D'Amico (El Dorado County) and Cindy Gustafson (Lake Tahoe-Placer County).

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Task Force went through the list of RCTF Issues and Objectives hearing brief reports from the members who've volunteered to work on each issue or objective (excluding those that are separately listed as agenda items).

RTP Guidelines: Celia McAdam stated the RTP Guidelines are adopted and this objective could be removed. The Task Force agreed that the responsibility should remain active in efforts to assist rural counties in completing RTP Updates for the 2002 STIP cycle.

AB 1012 Project Delivery Advisory Team Reports: A summary of these reports will be an item for discussion at the RCTF meeting July 21, 2000.

Federal Requirements Streamlining: The Task Force will ask Matt Boyer if he can continue to work on this subject even though he now works for the El Dorado County Public Works Agency rather than the El Dorado County Transportation Commission.

Local Programs Advanced Training and Outreach: Charles needs to ask if Spencer Clifton and Walt Allen can decide which of them will work with Debbie Whitmore (Stanislaus COG) on this subject.

Title VIII Civil Rights Review: Celia McAdam stated that she would keep an eye on this new concern on behalf of the RCTF.

2000 RCTF Biannual Meeting: During the RCTF meeting on July 21, 2000 there will be a discussion about whether or not the Task Force needs to hold a biannual meeting to invite a broader level of State and local government officials to consider consequences of the Governor's Initiative including trailer legislation.

Project Management and Project Monitoring: Walt Allen will work with Caltrans (Mark Rayback) to prepare a presentation regarding this subject for the July 21, 2000 RCTF meeting. This presentation shall include an overview of how AB 1012 monitoring requirements, CTIPS, and other monitoring programs all work in the overall picture of project monitoring.

Other Task Related Assignments:

FTA 5311 – Rick Gumz announced that Kathy Jacobs or Robert Chung will likely be managing the 5311 program after his retirement, at least until such time as these duties are reassigned. **Rick Gumz will ask Caltrans Mass Transit if Native American tribal transit is still a priority for discretionary funding within the program.**

Tribal Technical Assistance: Kevin Pokrajac announced that there will be a meeting of Native American casino organizers in August at the Jackson Rancheria for the purpose of meeting RTPA representatives and learning more about the transportation planning/funding process. RTPAs are supposed to contact Caltrans through their districts for lists of county or regional tribal organizations to be consulted when preparing their 2002 RTP Updates.

6. GOVERNOR'S INITIATIVE

Pete Hathaway (Deputy Director, CTC) advised that the Governor's Initiative contains a list of about 120 projects that are aimed primarily at congestion relief and interregional commerce. Most of them are in congested urban areas. Very few of the projects are fully funded with the General Fund revenues identified in the Governor's Initiative. There is a substantial gap of several billion dollars in matching funds will need to be found to pay for some projects identified in the Governor's Initiative. The way the Initiative was originally proposed, there was to be \$2.2 billion in general obligation bonds that would go before the voters in November. Now the Governor is no longer proposing a general obligation bond to match the General Fund monies. Instead, the \$2.2 billion is proposed to come from revenues on the sales tax on gasoline that presently goes into the General Fund (\$440 million a year for 5 years). Additional supplemental funding will come out of the RTIP and the ITIP and perhaps other sources in many cases.

Pete advised that the Initiative also proposes some changes to SB 45. The two that are probably the most important are that they propose to go from a 4-year STIP to a 7-year STIP and that they propose to change the formula inside the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) to enable Caltrans to invest not only in rural areas but more so in urban areas. There's a desire on the part of the State to open up the discussion also on whether the 25% share for the ITIP is enough. The State does not believe that 25% of STIP funds is enough to do the job that is necessary given their responsibility as owner/operators of the statewide highway system.

There are two things in the Governor's Initiative for rural areas. The first is that \$400 million shall be provided as direct subventions to cities and counties for local road purposes. The way these funds were previously intended to be distributed were by a formula that was going to be tilted toward rural counties. The way it is going forward at this time is that it has a blank space for the formula in the legislation to be figured out by the legislature. The second thing that is important to rural counties is that there may be a swap program that will allow the State to buy back RSTP and CMAQ monies. The State would buy back these federal funds and provide regions with State funds providing that the CTC will adopt a finding that they can afford to do so. Pete Hathaway clarified that this buy back proposal would be 90% State funds to the region in return for 100% federal funds from the region to the State. The 90% buy back concept is based on the fact that regions would save at least 10% by not having to carry out federal requirements.

Several Task Force members pointed out that the proposed 90% buy back of federal CMAQ and RSTP funds means very little to most rural counties. This is because rural counties are already able to exchange 100% of the RSTP and only a handful of rural counties receive any CMAQ funds.

Pete Hathaway continued his explanation of the Governor's Initiative by indicating that the Senate has a problem with the fact that the Governor's Initiative does not include provisions for local sales tax (SCA 3). Senate pro Tem Burton will stress that sales tax reauthorization legislation is needed in order to provide the additional match that is necessary to fund the Governor's list of transportation congestion relief projects. The Assembly has indicated that their main problem may be that the legislation does not address the ongoing need for local road rehabilitation and maintenance funds. The Assembly has a bill that would take not only the \$400 million proposed in the Governor's Initiative but another \$400 million (the last \$400 million that is available from sales tax on gasoline) and put it into a local subvention increase on an ongoing basis.

A Conference Committee that has been made up with representatives from both houses of the legislature will begin meeting next Tuesday (May 23, 2000) to consider the Governor's Initiative and competing transportation funding proposals. The way changes to the State's transportation program will probably play out will be in three parts. Some of it probably will be in the budget itself. The second part of the program will involve trailer legislation. Thirdly, some items that are not time-sensitive, such as changes to the ITIP, will likely be part of a separate bill. We should see the final outline of the Governor's Initiative by July with details following in an omnibus bill sometime in August or September.

Pete said there doesn't seem to be a lot of opposition to \$1.5 billion going from the General Fund to fund transportation this year. There doesn't seem to be a lot of opposition to at least a one-time subvention going to local road rehab and maintenance. He also assumes, based on what he has heard, that there is not opposition to a lot of the projects on the Governor's list of congestion relief projects. Some projects "on the margin" may be controversial, they may get dropped or changed. Pete stated that at this point he would stop and ask if there were any questions.

Scott Maas (Lassen) asked, "how does this benefit the rurals"? Pete returned to the discussion of the \$400 million available one-time for local street and road rehab and the fact that the formula that was originally discussed tilted most of these funds to rural areas. Pete stated that without this formula tilted toward the rurals he sees that the Governor's Initiative does not benefit the rural counties much at all.

Celia McAdam said that the \$400 million one-time for cities and counties if based on past formula distributions, is almost laughable and may cause us more harm than good by letting people think that the local road rehab and maintenance needs are being taken care of. She stated that the Rural Counties Task Force met with representatives of other regional and city/county organizations last week and there was agreement across the table that the Governor's proposal of \$400 million one-time for local road rehabilitation and maintenance was a "drop in the bucket" compared to total local road rehabilitation and maintenance needs. The RCTF and other regional and local government organizations all agreed to request that the Governor and legislature increase this amount to \$500 million annually from a permanent source (not subject to annual budget review) to be provided as a direct subvention to cities and counties for street and road rehabilitation and maintenance.

She stated that the part of the Governor's Initiative that causes even more harm is the proposal to change the ITIP formula so the Governor may use ITIP funds presently earmarked for rural areas to pay for his list of congestion relief projects in urbanized areas. She stated that a lot of rural counties are counting on IIP funds to match RIP regional shares for important State highway projects that have come up through the regional transportation planning process over many years.

Pete Hathaway said that Caltrans has a lot of highway projects in rural areas that have been started. If the Governor's Initiative takes money from these projects, they will complete environmental review and design and be placed on the shelf. He does not think that the State will allow these projects to go stale, especially if in future years there continue to be delivery problems, including the problems associated with delivering some of the projects in the Governor's Initiative. At that time these shelf projects would be funded and completed. The situation is a lot more problematic for rural highway projects that are in the planning stages right now.

Wes McDaniel (El Dorado) reviewed the list of points that was agreed upon by CALCOG during their meeting on Monday, May 22, 2000. He said that for the most part they are complimentary of rural concerns. These points included the following:

1. The \$440 million proposed to be taken from the sales tax on gasoline should be increased to \$500 million and distributed to cities and counties for local road rehabilitation and maintenance. This amount should also be increased by another \$1 million per year for transit operating costs.
2. They suggested taking all of the sales tax on gasoline and applying it toward transportation.
3. State government should continue to pursue SCA 3 (loss of local sales tax revenues costs the State more than \$1 billion a year).
4. They propose that flexibility be included in the legislation to enable funds to be shifted from a project identified in the Governor's Initiative to another project resolving the same problem if another alternative is deemed more appropriate.
5. Do not adjust the ITIP formulas as doing so would be a first step toward the unraveling of SB 45.
6. They agreed not to argue among themselves about projects to be added to the Governor's list.

Charles Field received confirmation from the Task Force participants in attendance that the Rural County Task Force issues associated with the proposed Governor's Initiative are as follows (in priority order):

1. The formulas for ITIP funds should not be adjusted.

2. The \$400 million provided one-time to cities and counties for local road rehabilitation and maintenance is not enough and it should be increased to \$500 million annually as a dedicated long-term direct subvention to cities and counties.
3. If the legislature does not increase funding for local road rehabilitation and maintenance as requested by item #2 above, then the formula for distribution of the \$400 million one-time as proposed by the Governor should be tilted to favor rural counties.
4. That if a statewide sales tax constitutional amendment such as SCA 3 is put forth, it should not preclude rural counties from being able to organize themselves and present local sales tax measures for approval by a majority of their county voters after November 2000 (in any future year).

Wes McDaniel stated that the RCTF should have a participant or participants speak at the Conference Committee meetings coming up on Tuesday, May 23. It was agreed that the RCTF would contact the Conference Committee to ask that RCTF participants be allowed to provide testimony during the session on May 24, 2000.

Celia McAdam passed around draft letters that she prepared for RCTF participants to send to Conference Committee members and their legislators concerning the above listed two priority concerns, the IIP formula and local road rehabilitation and maintenance funding. She stressed the importance of all rural counties sending these letters as soon as possible. Pete Hathaway counseled that each region should tailor their letter concerning the IIP to their own region's situation be it agriculture, tourism, etc. It was also noted that if a rural region is relying on IIP funds for important partnerships for State highway projects, then these should also be addressed in letters concerning the IIP. Tim James from Senator Leslie's office stated that he would like to get copies of letters from all 13 counties in Senate District 1. They would provide an effective package for Senator Leslie to use in representing 13 of the State's 28 rural counties concerning this issue. **Task Force participants unanimously agreed that letters from the RCTF concerning the IIP and the local road rehabilitation and maintenance concerns should be sent to the Governor, as well as the Conference Committee, and all State legislators.**

Pete Hathaway cautioned that if SCA 3 becomes a part of this year's transportation legislation, then rural counties better be ready with their expenditure plans. George Dondero indicated that at the CALCOG meeting on Monday (May 15, 2000) there were a number of COGs (including those representing urban areas) who indicated they may not be ready with expenditure plans by November 2000 and there is support to amend SCA 3 to enable expenditure plans to come forth after the general election. Chuck Oldham stated that the parts of SCA 3 that are more likely to survive the current legislative session would involve re-authorization of sales tax by majority vote in those regions that have already passed a sales tax.

7. 2000 STIP

Pete Hathaway announced that Caltrans provided the CTC with a fund estimate for a 2000 STIP at the May meeting. The fund estimate will likely be adopted at the CTC meeting in June. The fund estimate contains approximately \$1.5 billion. Approximately \$0.5 billion may be given to Caltrans for the SHOPP program. The remainder will be available for the IIP and for RIP shares. A 2000 STIP schedule will likely be announced requiring submission of 2000 RTIPs around October. 2000 STIP hearings may be scheduled before the end of the calendar year.

Wes McDaniel asked about additional money that was offered to the RTPAs by the CTC during their May meeting. Pete advised that within the STIP the CTC is seeing regular reports

indicating that all programmed STIP funds will not necessarily be spent and a number of STIP projects are being delayed by one, two, and three years. The amount programmed but not being expended continues to grow and the cash balance may be increased by more than \$800 million at the end of this fiscal year. The outlook for more delays in Caltrans project delivery is considerable given that Caltrans has not completed the number of project environmental documents that are needed to keep on schedule. During the last CTC meeting Commissioner Wolf suggested that some of the money that is not going to be spent on time due to delays in project deliveries (\$800 million), should be made available to the regions for their shelf ready projects as well as to Caltrans for their SHOPP projects. Caltrans has many SHOPP projects shelf ready to be delivered; more than the \$1.25 billion that they delivered last year, so Caltrans' is asking to use this money for the SHOPP. The outcome is not known. It should be remembered that funds from delayed projects that are expended now are going to come due in the future to be spent on those projects for which they are obligated. The net effect is that there may be more money in the early years of the STIP and less money available in later years.

Charles asked if he was correct in understanding that based on what he read in the Governor's May Revised Budget, any new funds brought forth by adding three more years to the STIP will be handled as part of the regularly scheduled 2002 STIP cycle? Pete Hathaway stated that CTC's expecting to adopt the smaller \$1.5 billion fund estimate at their June meeting and that it is most likely, although uncertain, that any new funding provided out of a seven year STIP would be handled as part of the 2002 STIP cycle.

8. RURAL PLANNING ASSISTANCE FUNDS

Dan Landon reported that the doubling of Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) from \$2 million to \$4 million each year is a part of budget finance letter #5. It has the support of the Legislative Analyst's Office and it is in good shape to be approved as part of the Caltrans budget for 2000/01. He suggested that rural counties need to keep their legislative representatives informed to ensure this increase in RPA remains in the budget as it is adopted. Caltrans planning, and especially Sharon Scherzinger and Joan Sollenberger, were given thanks by the Task Force representatives for their personal involvement in this effort. In addition, thanks was offered to Senator Tim Leslie and his staff who came forward to support the effort at some key moments.

Sharon Scherzinger handed out charts titled "Rural Planning Allocation" (proposed \$4 million formula) showing how much each rural county can expect to be allocated when the budget is passed. **She encourage the RCTF participants to add or expand work elements in their OWPs for fiscal year 2000/01 to show how the new total formula allocations will be spent. She suggested that all rural RTPAs should complete their final OWPs for FY 2000/01 and submit their OWP agreements prior to July 1, 2000 so that the RPA funds may be allocated on July 1 or as soon as the budget is approved.** She explained that the department intends to keep the discretionary RPA planning program active although it will not utilize any part of the \$ 4 million at the present time. The purpose of the discretionary fund would be to collect funds from any counties who cannot spend all of their RPA in the next fiscal year and distribute them to worthwhile planning projects that can be completed before the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2001). **Charles suggested that rural counties may want to develop shelf ready transportation planning projects that can be delivered in less than six months.** These supplemental work elements can be kept on the shelf until January or February when the discretionary program may be activated to expend RPA money that is being turned back by any counties that cannot deliver. The common goal of the RCTF has to be that no RPA funds are left on the table at the end of next fiscal year.

Eia Lehman distributed and reviewed a sample “RTPA FY 99/00 Overall Work Program Quarterly Report” form. Rural counties will be required to submit these forms as part of their quarterly report. They will be used to track rural RTPAs completion of planning work elements. If after the review of the first and second quarter reports (October 2000 and January 2001) a rural county is not making adequate progress toward completion of any RPA funded project, then these counties may lose their RPA funding to the discretionary pot. She explained that the preferred format for submitting this information would be electronic and via Excel. It should be sent to the district and then forwarded on to her. If an agency does not use Excel, they should contact Eia directly (916-653-1305) for assistance. Eia also complimented Glenn County and Colusa County for being the first counties to submit their OWPs electronically on CDs. **She said that any county who has already developed their own expenditure and project tracking spreadsheet does not need to use the one that she is providing today as long as the same information is available.**

Eia also provided a budget revenue sheet which needs to be a part of every adopted OWP because it sets up the database that they will use to monitor progress via the quarterly reports. Charles stated that delivery of RPA planning projects needs to be an agenda item for both the October and December ACTC meeting in order to ensure that RPA funds are being spent and in those counties where they are not being spent they are offered up to other regions who can get them spent. Jess Moreno, Caltrans Mass Transit, stated that before rural county applies TDA funds to a transportation planning project in their OWP, they should contact his office to ensure that they will not be disallowed based on subsequent review by Caltrans of the OWP. If you have questions about eligibility of use of TDA funds for planning projects, please contact him before it becomes a problem.

9. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT UNMET NEEDS PROCESS

Jess Moreno provided a brief overview of the Unmet Needs process as identified in the Transportation Development Act. He answered questions offered by some Task Force members about how the process is to be run as well as about the definition of Unmet Needs and Unmet Needs that are “reasonable to meet”.

10. FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING SOFTWARE

Steven Guhin of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) provided a brief presentation concerning the proposal to develop a software program that will replace or supplement the existing Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Local Assistance Procedures Guidelines, and “STIP Guidelines and Procedures” and their forms. The intent is to make something like “turbo tax” available to improve local project delivery. SACOG is requesting RCTF’s support for a State and regional planning partnership grant for this purpose. Kevin Pokrajac stated that Caltrans local programs had questions about the cost effectiveness of this effort. It may cost more than \$1.5 million to develop this program and the department has concerns that the amount of improved delivery may not warrant this expense. Charles Field noted that Caltrans planning may also have concerns about whether or not a project monitoring and delivery application is eligible for planning funds and that \$1.5 million may take a big chunk of SPR funds away from other worthwhile planning projects. **The Task Force participants agreed to support SACOGs effort in concept while acknowledging that there may be some serious questions about the cost effectiveness and use of SRP funding that remain to be answered.**

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.

Memorandum

Item 3

To: Chairman and Commissioners

Date: July 10, 2000

From: Robert I. Remen

File No: F 9
Book Item 4.1
Action

Ref: STATE LEGISLATION

State Budget and Governor's Traffic Congestion Relief Plan

Governor Davis signed AB 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000), the State Budget Bill, on June 30, 2000. The budget process set aside \$2 billion from the State General Fund for the Governor's Traffic Congestion Relief Plan (TCRP). AB 2928 (Chapter 91, Statutes of 2000), which was signed by the Governor on July 6, 2000, appropriates the \$2 billion and defines the TCRP. A summary of AB 2928 follows and the Governor's signing message to the Legislature is attached.

The project list in the TCRP was amended by SB 406 (Chapter 92, Statutes of 2000) which was also signed by the Governor on July 6, 2000. The TCRP is also subject to clean-up legislation in August. The funding for the TCRP is composed of a \$1.5 billion General Fund appropriation and the transfer of \$500 million from the sales and use tax revenues from gasoline.

The Legislature began its Summer Recess July 7, 2000. Any further legislative action must wait until the Legislature reconvenes August 7, 2000. The Legislature's Final Recess begins August 31, 2000.

AB 2928 (Torlakson) - Transportation Finance, Chapter 91 Statutes of 2000

1. AB 2928 takes effect immediately as an urgency statute.
2. Extends the 4-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and the 4-year Fund Estimate process, to 5 years.

Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)

3. Establishes the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF) in the State Treasury and appropriates the money in the TCRF to:
 - Caltrans for allocation, as directed by the commission, to Caltrans and certain regional and local transportation entities for transportation projects listed in the bill,
 - The Controller for allocation to cities, counties, and cities and counties for street and road maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction,
 - The commission for the purposes of a funding exchange program established by the bill, and
 - Caltrans for rehabilitation and repaving projects on state highways.

4. Establishes a list of transportation projects eligible for funding with money from the TCRF, specifies the lead applicant for each project, and establishes a procedure for the lead applicant to apply to the Commission for funds for each project.
5. Authorizes the designated lead agency for a project specified in the TCRP to submit an application for an alternate or substitute project which is designed to relieve congestion consistent with this act if:
 - I. the specified project is delayed by environmental or other factor external to the control of the lead agency,
 - II. sufficient matching funds are not available,
 - III. the specified project is not included in or consistent with the respective regional transportation plan, or
 - IV. completion of the specified project would jeopardize completion of other projects previously programmed in the STIP.
6. Requires the Commission, not later than 90 days from the effective date of the act, in consultation with Caltrans and representatives from regional agencies and local agencies, and after a public hearing, to establish guidelines to implement this chapter. The guidelines shall include, but not be limited to:
 - I. criteria for project applications,
 - II. estimation costs,
 - III. assessment of capability to complete the project,
 - IV. allocation of funds to project phases,
 - V. timely expenditure of funds,
 - VI. management of changes to cost, scope, and schedules,
 - VII. assessment of progress in implementing projects, and
 - VIII. audit requirements.
7. Authorizes the Commission, upon adoption of implementing guidelines, to consider project applications, and requires that the Commission shall:
 - I. ascertain that a project is included in, or is consistent with, the appropriate regional transportation plan before approving a project application involving right-of-way or construction phases,
 - II. begin review of a project application within 30 days of receipt of the application,
 - III. either approve or deny a project within 90 days of receipt of the application and all requested information, and state specific reasons for denying an application,
 - IV. not deny, or unreasonably delay approval of, an application that meets the requirements of this chapter, including the guidelines adopted by the Commission,
 - V. direct Caltrans to allocate funds to the appropriate agency for projects specified in the TCRP, specifying the percentage rate of reimbursement for expenditures for each phase of the project, considering the funding shares from various sources that comprise the full funding of each phase.
8. Provides that approval of a project by the Commission shall be deemed rescinded if the responsible agency does not seek an allocation from the Commission and start the first phase of work during the fiscal scheduled in the approved project application.
9. Requires that Caltrans shall execute a cooperative agreement with the agency responsible for carrying out the work for reimbursement of project expenditures approved by the Commission, and shall use electronic reimbursement procedures to the extent prudent and practical.

10. Provides that funds allocated from the TCRF shall be available for encumbrance for three years after the date of allocation, and encumbered funds shall be available for liquidation for two additional years, unless the time limit is extended by an act of the Legislature. Any funds not expended by that time-limit shall revert to the TCRF.
11. Provides that after notifying the commission of savings in any phase of a project, the lead applicant may use those savings for expenditures on a later phase of the same project. If a project can be completed at a lower cost than expected, any savings shall be divided among all funding sources contributing to the project in the proportion each of the funding sources bears to the total funding for the project as defined in the approved project application. For the savings that revert to this program, the Commission shall determine the amount to be returned to the TCRF.
12. Requires that the Commission shall report annually, starting no later than February 2001, to the Governor and the Legislature on progress in implementation of the program. The report shall assess programwide implementation progress, and identify project schedules and delays, project failures, cost savings, and any opportunities for the specification of additional or alternative projects for funding. The Commission report may also discuss any significant issues associated with implementation of the program, and recommend changes that could improve implementation.
13. Requires the Commission to:
 - I. establish a program to allow exchange of federal regional surface transportation funds and federal congestion mitigation and air quality program funds for state transportation funds,
 - II. to propose guidelines and procedures to implement this section,
 - III. hold a public hearing on the guidelines,
 - IV. adopt the guidelines on or before February 1, 2001,
 - V. begin the exchange program on or before February 1, 2001, if it determines that funding is available for that purpose,
 - VI. amend its guidelines after holding a public hearing, but not between the time it notifies regional transportation planning agencies of the amount of state funds available for exchange and its approval of projects for exchange in any given year,
 - VII. include a summary of exchanges made pursuant to this section in its annual report to the Governor and Legislature pursuant to Section 14556.36, including an assessment of progress in implementing projects funded by exchanges, and discussion of issues and recommendations related to implementation of the exchange program.

Funding Provisions

14. Appropriates \$1,500,000,000 from the General Fund to the TCRF.
15. Appropriates \$400,000,000 from the TCRF to the Controller for allocation to cities and counties for certain, specified purposes of this bill.
16. Appropriates \$5,000,000 from the TCRF to the High-Speed Rail Authority for the purpose of commencing preliminary environmental documentation for the implementation of a high-speed rail service in California.
17. The sum of \$678,000,000 is intended to be provided in each of five successive fiscal years, commencing with the 2001-02 fiscal year.
18. Requires, for the 2000-01 fiscal year only, that all revenue, less refunds, derived under the state sales and use tax law at the 5% rate, resulting from state and federal motor vehicle fuel taxes, be transferred quarterly to the TCRF.
19. Requires the Controller to transfer the estimated amount that is attributable to revenue collected for the sale, storage, use, or other consumption in this state of motor vehicle fuel from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF), which the bill creates in the State Treasury.
20. Requires the Controller, for each quarter during the period commencing on July 1, 2001, and ending on June 30, 2006, to transfer from the TIF :
 - (a) to the TCRF, the sum of \$169,500,000, for a total transfer of \$3,390,000,000;
 - (b) to the Public Transportation Account 20% of the amount remaining in the TIF after the transfer described in (a),
 - I. to Caltrans, 50% for purposes of bus and passenger rail services, or transit capital improvement projects,
 - II. to the Controller, 25% for allocation to the State Transit Assistance program based upon proportional transit revenues of each transit operator to the total revenues of all operator in the State, and
 - III. to the Controller, 25% for allocation to the State Transit Assistance program based proportional population of each transportation planning agency's region to the population of the State.
 - (c) to Caltrans 40% of the amount remaining in the TIF after the transfer described in (a), for programming for transportation capital improvement projects, subject to all of the provisions governing the State Transportation Improvement Program;
 - (d) to the counties, including a city and county, 20% of the amount remaining in the TIF after the transfer described in (a), for apportionment in accordance with local subvention formulas; and
 - (e) to the cities, including a city and county, 20% of the amount remaining in the TIF after the transfer described in (a), for apportionment among the cities in the proportion that the total population of the city bears to the total population of all the cities in the state.

General Provisions

21. Authorizes money deposited into the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund that is not subject to the constitutional requirements of Article XIX of the California Constitution to be used for any transportation purpose authorized by statute.
22. Requires that funds transferred as described in (d) and (e) be deposited in local transportation accounts in order to avoid the commingling of those funds with other local funds and that the funds be used only for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and storm damage repair, as defined.
23. Requires cities and counties to maintain their existing commitment of local funds for street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and storm damage repair in order to remain eligible for allocation of the funds described in (d) and (e).
24. Requires, until June 30, 2001, that the amounts transferred to the TCRF from the General Fund be included for purposes of calculations relating to school funding required under the California Constitution.
25. Prohibits, for the 2000-01 fiscal year, any General Fund forecast of revenues used for implementation of superseding offsets of the annual vehicle license fee from including any revenue loss due to the transfer of Sales and Use Tax Law revenues to the TCRF.
26. Requires the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to give first priority for using its share of transit assistance and operation funds made available under this bill to providing the levels of bus service mandated under the consent decree entered into by the authority on October 29, 1996, in the case of Labor/Community Strategy Center, et al. v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

July 6, 2000

To Members of the Assembly:

I am signing Assembly Bill No. 2928, a comprehensive transportation funding measure which incorporates most of the proposals I made for almost \$5 billion in congestion relief, transportation system connectivity and goods movement projects. The bill also provides over \$1.4 billion in additional funds over five years for local street and road maintenance, transit operations and State Transportation Improvement Program projects.

However, I am reducing or eliminating certain appropriations made in Section 6 of the bill, which adds Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Article 5, Section 14556.40) to Part 5.3 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, by a total of \$93,800,000. These expenditures are being eliminated because I have specific concerns about the projects and their priority for inclusion in this plan, and about the precedent these projects would set with respect to state expenditures. Additionally, I am requesting that the Legislature enact subsequent legislation to correct certain technical defects in this bill and modify the financing of the program to have less of an impact on the State General Fund in future years.

I am reducing the expenditures in Chapter 4.5, Article 5, Section 14556.40, Subsection (a) of the Government Code by eliminating or reducing the following paragraphs:

Paragraph (120) is eliminated, which allocates \$1,500,000 to Yuba County for the Yuba Airport runway extension and associated improvements. This project is not a congestion relief project affecting most travelers in the area..

Paragraph (125) is eliminated, which allocates \$5,000,000 to the Orange County Transportation Authority for the Route 57 toll road environmental impact report and study for expansion project. The franchise agreement for this project prohibits use of state funds in this fashion.

Paragraph (130) is eliminated, which allocates \$3,500,000 to the City of Garden Grove for the Route 22; connector to the interchange with I-405. Over \$206 million for Route 22 is already included in paragraph (70).

Paragraph (131) is eliminated, which allocates \$800,000 to the town of Apple Valley for the Bear Valley Road closure project and Kasota Road safety redesign. Funding for this project may be available in the State Highway Operations and Preservation Program and through local street and road funding.

Paragraph (132) is eliminated, which allocates \$7,000,000 to Los Angeles County for the Fairway Drive grade separation project in the San Gabriel Valley. This project already has access to several funding sources through the Alameda Corridor East Project.

Paragraph (136) is eliminated, which allocates \$3,500,000 to City of Palmdale for the widening of Avenue S; between Route 14 and Route 138. This project does not appear to provide significant congestion relief or to fit other priorities for use of these funds.

Paragraph (137) is eliminated, which allocates \$5,500,000 to City of Lancaster for improvements to the Fox Field Industrial Corridor. This project does not appear to provide significant congestion relief or to fit other priorities for use of these funds.

Paragraph (138) is reduced by \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000, which allocates funds to the Cross Valley Rail Corridor Joint Powers Authority for the upgrade of railroad track from Visalia to Huron. This project mainly funds improvements to rail lines that will be used by short line freight rail. Although I recognize that this project may provide significant local goods movement capacity, I expect local and railroad funds to provide the majority of funding.

Paragraph (142) is reduced by \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 for the City of West Hollywood for the repair, maintenance, and mitigation of Santa Monica Boulevard. A portion this project appears to be eligible for the street and road maintenance funding provided in this measure.

Paragraph (143) is eliminated, which allocates \$1,900,000 to the Capital Corridor Joint Powers Authority for the expansion of intercity rail service between San Jose, Oakland, and the Sacramento region. Such service cannot be implemented this year, and the ongoing operating costs should be funded from the Public Transportation Account in due course.

Paragraph (144) is reduced by \$45,000,000 to \$5,000,000 for the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District for the seismic retrofit of the Golden Gate Bridge. It is my understanding that other funding sources are available, and Caltrans will be working with the District to assist in securing federal funding for this project.

Paragraph (147) is eliminated, which allocates \$7,000,000 to the Imperial Valley Association of Governments for the reconstruction of the I-8/Imperial Avenue interchange. This project does not appear to provide significant congestion relief or to fit other priorities for use of these funds.

Paragraph (155) is eliminated, which allocates \$8,600,000 to the City of Chula Vista to acquire right-of-way, build, and operate a 10-mile limited access toll facility from San Miguel Road to Otay Mesa Road and conduct a due diligence review, including an independent appraisal of the feasibility of acquisition by a public agency of the Route 125 franchise agreement authorized under Section 143 of the Streets and Highways Code. I do not support state funding for the acquisition of a private toll road franchise.

Additionally, I am taking identical actions on the same projects as listed in SB 406, a measure that corrects certain provisions of this bill.

Sincerely,

GRAY DAVIS

TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION RECAP

The largest issue with transportation funding and legislation this year has been the Governors Transportation Initiative. Also known as the Traffic Congestion Relief Plan, it is set forth in the recently adopted state budget and trailer bills, AB 2928 and SB 406. It provides little, if any, assistance for the needs of rural counties.

AB 2928 includes the following components:

- List of projects to receive funding. The only rural county receiving any funds is Kings County. All other projects are in urban areas, primarily in Los Angeles, the Bay Area, and San Diego. There was an effort in the legislature to add more projects to the original list, such as airport improvements in Yuba County, but these were largely blue-pencilled out.
- Sales Tax on Gasoline Dedicated to Transportation for the Next 5 Years Only
In the current fiscal year (FY 2000/01), all of the sales tax on gas will go to fund the projects listed on the Governor's proposal, which are listed in AB 2928. This includes the \$400 million for street and road rehabilitation, which will be distributed half to cities and half to counties, in accordance with existing gas tax formulas.

Efforts to obtain a \$500 million annual dedication of gas tax funds for street and road rehabilitation were unsuccessful.

For the next five years (FY 2001/02 - 2005/06), the sales tax on gasoline will be apportioned as follows:

- 1) First \$678 million goes to fund listed projects
- 2) Remainder is divided as follows:
 - 40% goes to STIP
 - 40% goes to local streets and roads in accordance with existing gas tax formulas
 - 20% goes to Public Transportation Account

With approximately \$1 billion of revenue estimated from gas tax annually, that puts a little over \$100 million extra to local streets and roads to be divided up statewide.

After FY 2005/06, the sales tax on gasoline revenues returns to the General Fund.

- ITIP Rules Remain
Provisions that would have removed the requirement that 15% of the ITIP funds be spent outside of urban areas were successfully deleted from the bill.
- SCA 3 Dead, at least for now
The State Constitutional Amendment proposed by Senator Burton to allow the passage of a transportation sales tax with a 50% majority is dead for the current session. However, the issue may come back in the future, at the urging of the Self Help Counties Coalition.
- RPA Funds Increased
The Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funds, provided by subvention through Caltrans and included in the state budget, were doubled for the FY 2000/01 budget to \$4 million.

June 21, 2000

TO: RCTF Participants
FROM: Charles Field, Chairman
SUBJET: 2000 STIP Schedule

During their meeting on June 14, 2000, the CTC adopted the following schedule for the 2000 STIP:

Regions submit RTIPs.	By September 29, 2000
Caltrans submits ITIP.	By September 29, 2000
CTC STIP hearings.	Oct. – Nov. 2000, to be scheduled
CTC publishes staff recommendations.	November 16, 2000
CTC adopts 2000 STIP Augmentation.	December 5-6, 2000 meeting

They also adopted a fund estimate and provided a handout indicating county RIP shares. (See attachment.) A formal package containing this information will be on its way to you from the CTC.

There was a discussion about the difficulties some regions will have in preparing RTIPs for the new unexpected funding amounts by September. The Commission acknowledged there needs to be some flexibility for regions who will not be ready by September. However, regions who are not ready to program their funds by October or November may want to consider leaving them on the table as an unobligated balance to be programmed along with the next STIP cycle. This is because the State needs to advance funds to projects that are ready to go and doesn't want to wait for slow counties while it has a growing fund balance. (In fact, if you have projects that can be advanced, then you should probably contact the CTC directly). The next STIP cycle is expected to occur as follows: Fund Estimate by August 2001, RTIP submittals by December 2001, and adoption by 2002.

Also, as a closely and related matter, Therese McMillan of MTC and Vic Kamhi of LACMTA (in his last meeting as Regional Agencies Moderator) advocated at the June CTC meeting for more flexibility about timely submittals for the 2000 cycle, in light of the Governor's Initiative. The Commissioners seemed responsive to that request, and that CTC staff is preparing corresponding language for the STIP Guidelines for action at the July CTC meeting.

2000 STIP FUND ESTIMATE AUGMENTATION
COUNTY AND INTERREGIONAL SHARES
Includes STIP Amendments and Allocations Anticipated Through June 2000
(\$1,000's)

County	Prior STIP Balances		Added Capacity	Total Programming Capacity Available	Advances Remaining	Project Development Element (AB1012)
	Unprogr'd Balance	Balance Advanced				
Alameda	8,511	0	28,370	36,881	0	11,210
Alpine/Amador/Calaveras	3,708	0	4,653	8,361	0	1,839
Butte	9,190	0	5,469	14,659	0	2,161
Colusa	0	350	1,403	1,053	0	554
Contra Costa	7,595	0	17,673	25,268	0	6,983
Del Norte	0	4,666	1,340	0	3,326	629
El Dorado LTC	1,868	0	3,238	5,106	0	1,280
Fresno	0	47,464	18,662	0	28,802	7,374
Glenn	0	343	1,537	1,194	0	607
Humboldt	16,227	0	5,595	21,822	0	2,211
Imperial	10,142	0	8,692	18,834	0	3,435
Inyo	4,038	0	7,359	11,397	0	2,908
Kern	139	0	24,467	24,606	0	9,667
Kings	1,843	0	3,554	5,397	0	1,404
Lake	7,957	0	2,308	10,265	0	912
Lassen	0	276	3,375	3,099	0	1,334
Los Angeles	31,762	0	179,702	211,464	0	71,004
Madera	248	0	3,049	3,297	0	1,205
Marin	0	0	5,847	5,847	0	2,310
Mariposa	31	0	1,136	1,167	0	449
Mendocino	405	0	5,215	5,620	0	2,061
Merced	462	0	6,058	6,620	0	2,394
Modoc	3,098	0	1,852	4,960	0	732
Mono	0	2,150	5,392	3,242	0	2,130
Monterey	0	10,065	10,037	0	28	3,966
Napa	2,730	0	3,330	6,060	0	1,316
Nevada	602	0	2,831	3,433	0	1,118
Orange	59,198	0	48,888	108,086	0	19,317
Placer TPA	0	7,448	4,583	0	2,865	1,811
Plumas	2,940	0	2,102	5,042	0	831
Riverside	27,578	0	33,496	61,074	0	13,235
Sacramento	156	0	23,638	23,794	0	9,340
San Benito	699	0	1,676	2,376	0	662
San Bernardino	12,125	0	46,360	58,486	0	18,318
San Diego	34,971	0	56,372	91,343	0	22,274
San Francisco	814	0	15,275	16,089	0	6,036
San Joaquin	22,747	0	12,386	35,133	0	4,894
San Luis Obispo	0	616	10,081	9,466	0	3,983
San Mateo	4,762	0	15,441	20,203	0	6,101
Santa Barbara	1,818	0	11,876	13,694	0	4,692
Santa Clara	0	0	33,347	33,347	0	13,176

Santa Cruz	1,846	0	5,901	7,747	0	2,331
Shasta	3,834	0	5,949	9,783	0	2,350
Sierra	1,106	0	975	2,081	0	385
Siskiyou	0	18	4,149	4,131	0	1,639
Solano	0	0	8,507	8,507	0	3,361
Sonoma	7,160	0	10,281	17,441	0	4,062
Stanislaus	15,931	0	9,347	26,278	0	3,693
Sutter	126	0	2,108	2,234	0	833
Tahoe RPA	3,136	0	1,405	4,541	0	555
Tehama	3,539	0	2,945	6,484	0	1,164
Trinity	1,983	0	2,139	4,122	0	845
Tulare	33,872	0	11,611	45,483	0	4,588
Tuolumne	2,348	0	2,432	4,780	0	961
Ventura	3,528	0	16,953	20,481	0	6,698
Yolo	103	0	4,579	4,682	0	1,809
Yuba	129	0	1,804	1,933	0	713
Statewide Regional	357,005	73,396	768,750	1,087,380	35,021	303,750
Interregional	0	70,363	256,250	185,887	0	101,250
Statewide Total	357,005	143,759	1,025,000	1,273,267	35,021	405,000

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM – MS32

1120 N STREET

P. O. BOX 942873

SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001

PHONE (916) 653-1818

FAX (916) 653-1447



June 20, 2000

Dear Rural Counties Task Force Member:

Notices of Proposed Rulemaking were published in the *Federal Register* on May 25, 2000, for Statewide and Metropolitan Transportation Planning, for Intelligent Transportation Systems and for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Related Procedures for Transportation Decision-making, Protection of Public Parks, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges, and Historic Sites. The proposed rules implement the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. They are posted on the FHWA website: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>.

Although we anticipate you and other transportation planning agencies throughout the state will comment individually, we think a collective California transportation comment is important. We would appreciate your assistance in the preparation of this response and to that end, we will include discussion of the proposed rules among the agenda items at the July 21, 2000, meeting of the Rural Counties Task Force. (This topic will also be discussed at the July 10, 2000, meeting of the Regional-Caltrans Coordination Group.)

Discussion should focus on policy-level issues. Planning staff from our District offices are contacting transportation planning agencies to solicit more detailed input.

If you are unable to attend this meeting, you may provide written input to Sharon Scherzinger, Chief, Office of Regional and Interagency Planning, Caltrans Transportation Planning Program.

Mailing address: P.O. Box 942874, MS-32, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

Fax: (916) 653-1447 or

E-mail: Sharon.Scherzinger@dot.ca.gov

Please submit written comment to Ms. Scherzinger prior to July 14, 2000.

Sincerely,

JOAN SOLLENBERGER, Program Manager
Transportation Planning

c: Caltrans District Offices, attention Division Chiefs for Planning and Public
Transportation
Caltrans Environmental Program, attention Brian Smith and Barbara McDonnell
Caltrans New Technology and Research Program, attention Joan Borucki
Bob Remen, CTC
Reza Navai, TPP

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

CHARLES FIELD, CHAIRMAN
AMADOR COUNTY TRANS. COMM.
(209) 267-2282

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE CHAIRMAN
DEL NORTE CO. TRANS. COMM.
(707) 465-3878

DARIN GROSSI, SECRETARY
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601

July 12, 2000

TO: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

FROM: Charles F. Field, Chairman

SUBJECT: Rural County Project Delivery Resource Problems

Over the past year, several rural counties have indicated that they have been having difficulty in maintaining staff and other resources necessary to fulfill all responsibilities involved in timely delivery of local transportation projects. During the RCTF meeting on July 21, 2000, I propose to have a discussion regarding this subject.

- Is there a need to investigate a rural county resource and project delivery capability problem?
- Is this subject worthy of a separate RCTF workshop?
- Are there some rural counties who are having success in project delivery who can share their strategies with counties who are having problems?
- Do we need to mount a RCTF effort to improve rural county local project delivery that goes beyond current efforts which are aimed specifically at Caltrans Local Assistance and Federal permit streamlining?

CF/nc

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

CHARLES FIELD, CHAIRMAN
AMADOR COUNTY TRANS. COMM.
(209) 267-2282

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE CHAIRMAN
DEL NORTE CO. TRANS. COMM.
(707) 465-3878

DARIN GROSSI, SECRETARY
TUOLUMNE CO/CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL
(209) 533-5601

July 12, 2000

TO: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

FROM: Charles F. Field, Chairman

SUBJECT: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5311

La Keda Johnson, Caltrans Office of Federal Transit Assistance, will be discussing the proposed timeline for submitting Section 5311 projects in the next grant, federal fiscal year 2000-2001. Of particular concern is the timing for submitting required documents to Caltrans for projects using Congestion Management and Air Quality, Surface Transportation Program, and federalized State Transportation Improvement Program funds for inclusion in the next 5311 grant. The discussion will provide early notification and a framework for beginning a dialog between regional transportation planning agencies and Caltrans in order to afford maximum coordination of regional and state processes involved in preparing projects and the timely submittal of the grant to FTA.

RCTF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES
Reports for July 21, 2000

<u>ISSUE/OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>ASSIGNED</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
CTC Representative	Susan Morrison	No Report
Local Road Rehab Funding & STIP Protection (Gov.'s Initiative)	Celia McAdam	Agenda Memo and Verbal Report
Formulas for Distribution of Local Road Funds		New Assignment
OWP Planning and PPM Funds	Dan Landon	Verbal Report
Clarify/Improve OWP Process	Charles Field	No Report *
Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP)	Darin Grossi	No Report *
HBRR/HES Exchange and Federal Aid Project Streamlining	Matt Boyer	No Report *
SB 45 Project Monitoring/Reporting Database	Walt Allen	No Report *
Local Assistance "Enhanced Training Committee"	Walt Allen	No Report *
City/County/Caltrans FHWA Coordinating Group	Spencer Clifton	No Report *
Committee to Review Changes to Local Assistance Procedures and Guidelines Manuals	Liz Gillingwater	No Report *
RSTP/CMAQ/TEA Project Delivery Committee	Dan Landon	No Report *
RTP/RTIP Rural County Performance Measures	Dan Landon	No Report *
Caltrans Regional Planning and Programming Coordination Committee	---	No Report *
California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS)	George Dondero	No Report *
Rules for Pre-Performance Audits	Scott Maas	No Report *
2000 RCTF Biannual Meeting	Phil Dow	No Report *
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Applicability to Rural Counties	Phil Dow	No Report *
FTA 5310 and Welfare to Work Advisory Committee	Susan Morrison	No Report *
TEA Advisory Committee	Phil Dow	No Report *
California Aviation System Plan Steering Committee	Dan Landon	No Report *
State's Role in Mass Transportation Advisory Committee	Phil Dow	No Report *
1998 California Transportation Plan Advisory Committee	Phil Dow	No Report *
State Planning Guidelines Development Quality Team	Charles Field	Verbal Report

Garvee Bonds Guidelines Committee

Scott Maas

No Report*

Civil Rights Review Title 9

Celia McAdam

No Report

RCTF Dues

Dan Landon

No Report*

***Verbal reports or discussion of any item listed may occur during the meeting regardless of whether or not a written report is included with this agenda packet.**